

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/720,636	ZEIDMAN, ROBERT M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	JAMES RUTTEN	2192	

All Participants:

(1) JAMES RUTTEN

(2) Marina Portnova, Reg. No. 45,750

Date of Interview: 23 May 2008

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: Proposed Claims (Attached).

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims discussed:

23, 31, 33, 41

Prior art documents discussed:

Clough

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: Allowable

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 4 pm (EDT)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

On 5/14/08, the Examiner contacted Ms. Portnova in regard to allowable subject matter as described on page 13 of the originally filed specification regarding calculation of a similarity number. Also indicated that claim 32 depends from canceled claim 31 and should instead depend from claim 30. The Examiner suggested incorporating allowable subject matter into each of the independent claims. Ms. Portnova agreed to discuss the proposal with the Applicant.

On 5/16/08, Ms. Portnova indicated that subject matter on page 13 was directed to an alternate embodiment which was not claimed. Ms. Portnova suggested that the proper calculation of a similarity number was found on page 10.

Upon further review, the Examiner found that this calculation was not found in the prior art, and on 5/21/08 proposed another amendment. After discussing the amendment with the Applicant, Ms. Portnova agreed to an amendment and faxed a copy of a proposed amendment to the Examiner. The examiner agreed to make an examiner's amendment using Ms. Portnova's proposal.